



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/909,587	07/20/2001	Richard O. Shuler	043340/237124	2209
826	7590	03/13/2008	EXAMINER	
ALSTON & BIRD LLP			WINTER, JOHN M	
BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA				
101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000			3621	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/13/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09909587	7/20/2001	SHULER ET AL.	043340/237124

EXAMINER

JOHN M. WINTER

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

20080225

3621

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

A1. The USPTO's Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences ("Board") returned this application to the Examiner. See "Order Returning Undocketed Appeal to Examiner" mailed December 28, 2007 ("2007 Order").

A2. In the 2007 Order, the Board ordered the Examiner to:

- (1) to issue and mail a PTOL-90 having the missing references listed under the Evidence Relied Upon section, paragraph (8);
- (2) to clarify the status of the Evidence submitted by Appellants after Appeal in the Appeal Brief; and
- (3) for such further action as may be appropriate.

A3. In accordance with (1) above, the Examiner states that at page 9 line 2 of the Examiners Answer filed on March ,7, 2007, "the Downes reference" was erroneously referred to. Instead, the intended reference was " the Pratt reference." The Pratt reference is of record and noted in the Examiner's Answer.

A4. In accordance with (2) above, the reference cited by the Appellant in the Appeal Brief (received on November 14,2006) was not previously presented to the Examiner. Nevertheless, the Examiner has considered the reference.

A5. In accordance with (3) above, it is the Examiner's position that no further action is necessary.

/ANDREW J. FISCHER/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3621

